DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 204 817 CS 503 424

AUTHOR Perrill, Norman K.; Stopek, Carrie D.
TITLE Organizational Selection and Appraisal Criteria: Field Test of a New Data-Gathering Instrument in a Continuing Study.
PUB DATE May 81
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association (Minneapolis, MN, May 21-25, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Communication Research; Data Collection; Decision Making; *Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; Field Studies; *Interviews; Measures (Individuals); Organizational Communication; Organizational Effectiveness; *Organizations (Groups); *Personnel Evaluation; *Personnel Selection

ABSTRACT

Employee selection and appraisal criteria were examined in 44 organizations to (1) test a new data gathering instrument, (2) determine the extent to which student interviewers and organizational interviewees had similar perceptions of the importance of the selection and appraisal criteria used in that organization, and (3) continue and expand an ongoing study of the relationship between criteria used for selection and those used for appraisal. The instrument proved to be useful but potentially harmful in influencing the data. Data were analyzed using both parametric and nonparametric correlations. Student and organizational perceptions were found to agree to a surprising degree, especially evidenced by perfect agreement in ranking 22 criteria perceived as most important for selection and 22 perceived as most important for appraisal. Seventeen of the top 22 were common to both selection and appraisal. (Author/RL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED204817

ORGANIZATIONAL SELECTION AND APPRAISAL CRITERIA: FIELD TEST OF A NEW DATA-GATHERING INSTRUMENT IN A CONTINUING STUDY

Norman K. Perrill

and

Carrie D. Stopek

Department of Communication
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ 85281
(602) 965-5095

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Norman K. Perrill
Carrie D. Stopek

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Division 4

Annual Conference, International Communication Association

Minneapolis, Minnesota

May 21-25, 1981

CS503424

ORGANIZATIONAL SELECTION AND APPRAISAL CRITERIA: FIELD TEST OF A NEW DATA-GATHERING INSTRUMENT IN A CONTINUING STUDY

INTRODUCTION AND BACKROUND OF THE STUDY

This research project is the continuation of an ongoing investigation, begun in 1975, of the process of selecting/hiring and evaluating/appraising employees in a variety of organizations. A major focus of this ongoing investigation has been on the criteria or standards used by organizations during the selection and/or appraisal processes. Although a number of "lists" of criteria were available in the literature (Howell & Vincent, 1970; Hakel & Schuh, 1971; Field & Holley, 1975), there was little evidence to suggest that they were "standard" across organizations. Thus, the research team began in 1975 and 1976 with a project to determine, in part, what criteria were used by a wide variety of organizations (n=67) in making decisions during selection and/or appraisal. That initial study resulted in a list of 76 criteria which appeared frequently enough to suggest fairly wide usage, although the criteria used were far from consistent across organizations.

In a study of 97 additional organizations, completed during 1976-1977 (Perrill & Bueschel, 1980), the "list of 76" criteria from the 1975-1976 study was used to code the criteria reported. Undergraduate students enrolled in an interviewing class at a large university, after studying interviewing techniques and procedures associated with information-gathering, were instructed (as a final project) to select an organization and interview personnel responsible for selection and appraisal of employee. Students were given a four-page guide prepared by the instructor to assist them in gathering information. The Information-Guide was designed primarily to assist students in preparing their interview schedules. Although it was quite detailed in the information requested, it was not a highly-standardized interview schedule; however, students were required, in part, to ask their organizational respondents (the interviewees) what standards or criteria were used as bases for selection and/or appraisal. Thus, criteria were again reported by the organization as voluntary responses to questions. Neither the students nor the organizational interviewees were allowed to see the "list of 76" criteria. The researchers, however, used the "list of 76" as the basis for coding organizational responses as reported by the student interviewers.

Subsequently, on the basis of the Perrill and Bueschel study, the list of criteria was reduced to 40, through a process of deletion and combination. The resulting criteria were judged to represent all of those on the "list of 76 which had occurred in as few as 2-3 per cent of the 97 cases studied.

PURPOSE AND RATIONALE

The purpose of the present study was threefold. First, the study sought to test the use of a standardized instrument for rating criteria used in selection/hiring procedures and/or in appraisal/performance-review procedures. Since the standardized reporting form had not been used in the past nor formally pretested, it was felt that evaluation was needed to determine its effectiveness. As an additional check on the instrument, respondents were urged to add additional comments about the clarity of the criteria categories, as well as the degree of difficulty they had in completing the form. Second, the study was designed to determine the extent to which students' perceptions of the criteria used by the organizations during

selection and/or appraisal agreed with the organizations' (the interviewees') perceptions. For the benefit of further organizational research using student interviewers, and to help determine the research value of the assignment as a final project in the interviewing class, a check on the agreement between student interviewers and organization respondents (the interviewees) seemed necessary. Third, the study continued the ongoing investigation of relationships between the standards or criteria used for selecting/hiring and those used for evaluating/appraising employees in a variety of organizations. In addition, the current study was designed to yield data on the relative importance attached to the various criteria by both students and organizations.

Concerning the third purpose (investigating the relationship between the two sets of standards or criteria, those used for employment selection and those used for performance appraisal) it should be noted that the employment/selection process is supposedly used by the organization as a tool for determining the extent to which a potential employee possesses the qualifications required for a particular job. Ideally, the best qualified applicant will be hired. Similarly, during performance appraisal, the employee is evaluated to determine whether or not he or she is meeting the requirements or demonstrating the necessary qualifications to stay in his or her present position and/or demonstrating the qualifications for some other position in the organization. Again, ideally, the better qualified employee will be appraised or evaluated as worthy of promotion, transfer, and/or raise, etc.

This rationale rests on the belief that, logically, there should be a relationship between the criteria or standards used for employment/selection and those used for performance appraisal. In other words, if an organization selects or hires an individual according to certain criteria, then it seems reasonable that that same employee, once hired, would be evaluated or appraised according to those same criteria. If selection is based on Bonifide Occupational Qualifications (BFOQ's) established for the particular job, then it would seem to follow that performance evaluation should be based on the employee using, applying, or demonstrating those same qualifications.

For example, if an individual is hired, in part, because he or she presents evidence of "communication skills," it would seem appropriate for later performance evaluations to be based, in part, on the extent to which that employee had turned out to demonstrate effective communication on the job. If, on the other hand, "communication skills" are not required to perform a particular job effectively, then it would seem at least mildly inappropriate to require evidence of "communication skills" before hiring someone to do that job. If an individual is not appraised or evaluated by most, if not all, the criteria on which he or she was hired, then it would seem to follow that at least some of the criteria used in one process or the other are not job related (BFOQ's). Either the individual was selected on at least some criteria that are not necessary for successful performance on the job, or criteria necessary for successful job performance are not being used as the basis for performance evaluation, or both.

While one should not expect perfect correlation between selection and appraisal criteria, the authors do argue that, logically, the relationships should be strongly positive. Prior results from this ongoing project, however, have provided little evidence to suggest that organizations perceive this relationship. Only a few criteria have been found to be used for both selection and appraisal. For most criteria, given use for selection, the probability of use for appraisal has been found to be no better than chance, and visa versa.

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

As suggested in the previous section, this study was designed to (1) subject a new research instrument to its first field test; (2) determine the extent to which student interviewers agreed with their organizational interviewees in perceptions of the importance of some 40 criteria, as applied to (a) selection/hiring procedures, and (b) appraisal/performance-evaluation procedures; and (3) determine the extent to which the importance of criteria used for selection/hiring procedures correlated with the importance of those same criteria when applied to appraisal/performance-evaluation procedures.

In order to carry out the project, 58 students enrolled in two sections of an upper division university class in interviewing during the spring semester of 1980 were assigned the same task as discussed above, with the following modifications. First, the standardized reporting form was used, which required two types of Likert-scale responses to each of the 40 items (the "new " list of criteria). One response scale asked that each criterion be rated on its importance for selection (during hiring for employment). The second response scale asked for a rating on importance of each criterion for appraisal (during evaluation or review of performance of employees). Both scales ranged from 0 (Not used at all) through 5 (Used, and Extremely important). The complete form has been placed in Appendix A. Second, each student was given two copies of the response form. Students were instructed, on the basis of their interviews, to rate the importance of each item (criterion) for both the selection and appraisal procedures. Likewise, representatives from the organization (the interviewees) were given a copy of this same standardized reporting form and asked to fill out the form and send it back to the instructor. Forty-eight organizations returned the forms. Four were subsequently dropped from analysis because of duplication or the absence of a corresponding form from the student interviewer.

The 44 organizations ranged in size from 4 to 6,000 employees. The average size was 407; but that figure is misleading, since the median size was only 32 employees. Seventeen had fewer than 20 employees, 8 of those had 10 or fewer, and only 6 had more than 300. The types of organizations in this sample varied widely: from car stereo installers and a pool cleaning company to a major airline and branches or divisions of "Fortune - 500" companies. The sample represented manufacturing, retail product sales, food and health services, education, advertising, government, banking, hotel management, a non-profit agency, and a variety of other service organizations. It was certainly not a scientific sample, since students were free to choose any organization with which they had or could establish contact; however, it certainly represented a broad range of organizations, in both size and type.

Thus, for this sample of 44 organizations, two sets of data were reported on the list of 40 criteria. One set was reported by students as part of a written paper in which they were to summarize selection and appraisal procedures in the organization studied. The four page Information-Gathering Guide, discussed earlier, and the standardized reporting form that they were to complete after the interview, were included in the paper. The other set of data was reported by the representative of the organization (the interviewee) on the same standardized reporting form.

The data from all 88 forms (44 from student interviewers and 44 from the organizations) provided four ratings for each criterion, two ratings of importance for selection or hiring (one rating by student interviewers and one by the organization) and two ratings of importance for appraisal or performance-evaluation

(again, one by student interviewers and one by the organization). Computer analysis, using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS, 1975 & 1979), therefore, provided four mean ratings for each criterion. In addition, the student interviewers' ratings were correlated with the organizational interviewees' ratings for both selection and appraisal; and selection-criteria ratings were correlated with appraisal-criteria ratings, for both student interviewers and organizational interviewees. A table of these findings has been placed in Appendix B.

RESULTS

The Instrument

Although using a standardized rating form to gather information about selection and appraisal criteria brought some consistency into the data-gathering, it was not without some cost. Twelve potential cases (21 per cent) were lost from the sample because 10 organizations and 2 student interviewers failed to return the form. One can only speculate that the complexity or the length of the instrument may have contributed to this loss of data. In the past, only rarely did students who completed the interviewing course fail to do the final project and provide information on the criteria an organization used during the processes of selection and/or appraisal. On the other hand, we had very few reports of difficulty with using the forms supplied during the present study from either students or organizations. With few exceptions, feedback indicated the forms were clear, the criteria categories were meaningful, and the response format was easy to use. In terms of clarity and ease of application, the instrument would appear to warrant further use in the field and as part of the final project for the interviewing class.

On the other hand, as a research instrument, reservations must be raised. The results provided below vary enough from prior results that one must raise the question of the extent to which the standardized form, itself, by presenting both the students and the organizations with a list of criteria, may have "prompted" responses. There seems to be some evidence that both students and organizations rated as "used" a greater number of criteria than were normally reported by students in prior studies on the basis of a combination of interview responses and information available from the organization's forms used for either selection or appraisal.

There is also evidence, as presented below, that the instrument may have prompted or created a perception of "relatedness" between selection and appraisal criteria--by presenting the criteria list and asking for each criterion to be rated on importance on two side-by-side scales, one for selection and one for appraisal. Further study will be required to determine whether presenting the scales sequentially or separately (a laborious procedure for both researchers and respondents) will preserve the benefits of a standardized form without introducing undue instrumental influence into the data-collection.

Agreement Between Student Interviewers and Organizational Interviewees

In general, the results indicated a fairly high degree of agreement between student interviewers and organizational interviewees in their perceptions of the importance of criteria, whether used for selection or appraisal. When the mean ratings on importance were used to rank-order the criteria, the 22 selection criteria rated most important by the student interviewers were exactly the same as the 22 criteria rated most important by the organizational interviewees. Likewise,

the 22 appraisal criteria rated most important were the same for both sets of respondents. Considering just the 10 top ranks, 7 of the top 10 selection criteria and 8 of the top 10 appraisal criteria were common to both lists. Tha rank ordering of the 22 highest rated selection criteria are presented in Table 1, the appraisal criteria in Table 2.

For the top 22 selection criteria, calculation of Spearman's Coefficient of Rank Correlation between student and organizational rankings yields a rho of .58 (see Table 3). For the top 22 appraisal criteria, the Spearman's rho between student and organizational rankings was .67 (see Table 4). (If one were to assume random selection of this organizational sample, which the authors do not claim, both correlations would be significant—selection criteria at the .01 level, appraisal criteria at the .001 level.)

For the overall list of 40 criteria, Pearson Product Moment correlations were computed for each criterion, as rated in importance, for: (1) selection and (2) appraisal, by (1) student interviewers and (2) organizational interviewees. This produced two sets of r-values, one derived from student and organizational ratings of selection criteria, the other from their ratings of appraisal criteria. These data are presented in Appendix B.

For selection criteria, the r-values ranged from .06 to .74, with a mean of .49 and all except one r-value above .24. While the r-values do not appear to be especially high, all except 3 would be technically significant at the .05 level for a random sample. (However, r-values as low as .26 achieved such "significance.") On the other hand, it should also be noted that where there was substantial agreement in mean ratings between student and organizational respondents, the restricted range of responses on the rating scales tended to depress the r-values. Overall, the correlations suggest a better-than-chance relationship between student interviewers and their organizational interviewees in their perceptions of the importance of criteria used by the organization during selection of employees.

For appraisal criteria, the r-values ranged from .03 to .73, with a mean of .41. Again, the correlations are not consistently high (yet all but 8 would again be technically significant at the .05 level for a random sample). Both the positive and negative "modifiers" discussed for selection criteria, above, should be applied to the appraisal criteria, too; however, the overall relationship again seems better-than-chance.

Relationship Between Criteria Used For Selection and Criteria Used For Appraisal

To determine the extent to which the organizations in this study used the same criteria when evaluating potential employees during selection and actual employees during appraisal, two calculations were performed. First, as in the previous section, Pearson Product Moment Correlations were computed. For this section, however, we were concerned with the association between the ratings of criteria used for selection and the ratings of criteria used for appraisal—(1) as perceived by student interviewers, and (2) as perceived by the organizational interviewees. For student ratings on the 40 criteria, the r-values ranged from .05 to .83, with a mean of .51. For organizational ratings, the r-values ranged from .04 to .83, with a mean of .48. While these mean r-values are higher than those reported above (for analysis of association between student and organizational perceptions) the same limitations should be applied. Again, the SPSS program reports all except 5 student and 8 organizational r-values as technically "significant"; however, such "significance" only required a correlation coefficient on each criterion of .27, and the sample cannot be claimed to be random. Again, however, the truncated range tended to depress r-values.

TABLE 1

RANK ORDER OF SELECTION CRITERIA, WITH MEAN RATINGS

Rank Order	Criterion Category Number, Name, and Mean Rating: Student's Perceptions of Selection Criteria	Organization's Perceptions of Selection Criteria
1	24, Interest (4.27)	30, Motivation (4.27)
2	30, Motivation (4.19)	23, Integrity & Honesty (4.19)
3	23, Integrity & Honesty (4.15)	1, Ability (4.16)
4	29, Maturity (4.14)	6, Attitude (4.06)
5	6, Attitude (4.12)	4, Aptitude & Intelligence (4.14)
6	31, Personality (4.07)	24, Interest (4.14)
7	9, Communication Skills (4.02)	9, Communication Skills (4.11)
8	26, Knowledge (3.98)	31, Personality (4.09)
9	33, Public Interaction (3.93)	3, Appearance (4.02)
10	1, Ability (3.91)	12, Dependability or Reliability (4.02)
11	38, Self-Confidence (3.91)	29, Maturity (4.02)
12	7, Availability (3.88)	38, Self-Confidence (4.02)
13	10, Cooperation (3.88)	5, Attendance (3.96)
14	22, Initiative (3.88)	10, Cooperation (3.96)
15	3, Appearance (3.86)	16, Experience - General (3.96)
16	17, Experience - Specific (3.84)	22, Initiative (3.96)
17	36, Responsibility (3.79)	17, Experience - Specific (3.93)
18	4, Aptitude & Intelligence (3.74)	7, Availability (3.89)
19	12, Dependability or Reliability (3.72)	33, Public Interaction (3.86)
20	5, Attendance (3.70)	26, Knowledge (3.80)
21	16, Experience - General (3.68)	28, Loyalty (3.77)
22	28, Loyalty (3.60)	36, Responsibility (3.68)

TABLE 2

RANK ORDER OF APPRAISAL CRITERIA, WITH MEAN RATINGS

Rank Order	Criterion Category Number, Name, and Mean Rating Student's Perceptions of Appraisal Criteria	Organization's Perceptions of Appraisal Criteria
1	34, Quality of Performance (4.65)	34, Quality of Performance (4.59)
2	36, Responsibility (4.47)	12, Dependability or Reliability (4.59)
3	1, Ability (4.43)	5, Attendance (4.57)
4	10, Cooperation (4.43)	1, Ability (4.55)
5	26, Knowledge (4.42)	36, Responsibility (4.55)
6	12, Dependability or Reliablity (4.41)	25, Judgment (4.52)
7	6, Attitude (4.39)	6, Attitude (4.48)
8	29, Maturity (4.33)	26, Knowledge (4.43)
9	22, Initiative (4.28)	30, Motivation (4.39)
10	5, Attendance (4.25)	10, Cooperation (4.36)
11	23, Integrity & Honesty (4.24)	24, Interest (4.34)
12	30, Motivation (4.23)	9, Communication Skills (4.32)
13	33, Public Interaction (4.19)	23, Integrity & Honesty (4.32)
14	35, Quantity of Productivity (4.19)	18, Follows Directions (4.27)
15	18, Follows Directions (4.14)	22, Initiative (4.25)
16	25, Judgment (4.14)	38, Self Confidence (4.25)
17	4, Aptitude & Intelligence (4.07)	4, Aptitude & Intelligence (4.23)
18	38, Self Confidence (4.07)	29, Maturity (4.23)
19	9, Communication Skills (4.05)	33, Public Interaction (4.21)
20	31, Personality (3.98)	35, Quantity of Productivity (4.21)
21	24, Interest (3.93)	2, Adaptability & Flexibility (4.07)
22	2, Adaptability & Flexibility (3.84)	31, Personality (4.07)

Table 3

SPEARMAN RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENT

FOR TOP TWENTY-TWO SELECTION CRITERIA

Criterion Category: Number & Name	Rank by Orgs. (OSC)	Rank by Students (SSC)	d	d^2
30, Motivation	2	2	- 1	1
23, Integrity & Honesty	2	3	- 1	1
1, Ability	3.5	10.5	- 7	49
6, Attitude	3.5	5	- 1.5	2.25
4, Aptitude & Intelligence	5.5	18	-12.5	156.25
24, Interest	5.5	1	4.5	20.25
9, Communication Skills	7	7	0	0
31, Personality	8	6	2	4
3, Appearance	10.5	15	- 4.5	20.25
12, Dependability or Reliability	10.5	19	- 8.5	72.25
29, Maturity	10.5	4	6.5	42.25
38, Self Confidence	10.5	10.5	0	0
5, Attendance	14.5	20	- 5.5	30.25
10, Cooperation	14.5	13	1.5	2.25
16, Experience - General	14.5	21	- 6.5	42.25
22, Initiative	14.5	13	1.5	2.25
17, Experience - Specific	17	16	1	1
7, Availability	18	13	5	25
33, Public Interaction	19	9	10	100
26, Knowledge	20	8	12	144
28, Loyalty	21	22	- 1	1
36, Responsibility	22	17	5	25
Totals	- -	- -	0	741.5

r_s = .58 (corrected for ties)

Table 4

SPEARMAN RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENT

FOR TOP TWENTY-TWO APPRAISAL CRITERIA

Criterion Category: Number & Name	Rank by Orgs. (OAC)	Rank by Students (SAC)	d	d^2
34, Quality of Performance	1.5	1	.5	.25
12, Dependability or Reliability	1.5	6	- 4.5	20.25
5, Attendance	3	10	- 7	49
1, Ability	4.5	3.5	1	1
36, Responsibility	4.5	2	2.5	6.25
25, Judgment	6	15.5	- 9.5	90.25
6, Attitude	7	7	0	0
26, Knowledge	8	5	3	9
30, Motivation	9	12	- 3	9
10, Cooperation	10	3.5	6.5	42.25
24, Interest	11	21	-10	100
9, Communication Skills	12.5	19	- 6.5	42.25
23, Integrity & Honesty	12.5	11	1.5	2.25
18, Follows Directions	14	15.5	- 1.5	2.25
22, Initiative	15.5	9	6.5	42.25
38, Self Confidence	15.5	17.5	- 2	4
4, Aptitude & Intelligence	17.5	17.5	0	0
29, Maturity	17.5	8	9.5	90.25
33, Public Interaction	19.5	13.5	6	36
35, Quantity of Productivity	19.5	13.5	6	36
2, Adaptability & Flexibility	21.5	22	- .5	.25
31, Personality	21.15	20	1.5	2.25
Totals	--	--	0	585.0

r_s = .67 (corrected for ties)

These mean correlations between selection and appraisal criteria (.51 from student data; .48 from the organizational data) are considerably higher than those reported last year ($\bar{X}$ = .14; Perrill & Bueschel, 1980). Moreover, there is less evidence to suggest that many of these perceived relationships are "trivial," as was though to be the case in the 1980 study because the longer "list of 76" criteria and the larger number of organizations resulted in some criteria having high r-values based on usage in both selection and appraisal in only one or two organizations. Although it is possible that these 44 organizations are quite different from the prior 97 and actually do select and appraise on similar sets of criteria, it may also be that the design of the instrument (presenting side-by-side scales for the rating of selection and appraisal criteria) may have influenced both students and organizations to perceive or create relationships which did not, in fact, exist. On the other hand, the side-by-side rating scales may have served to trigger recognition of actual relationships, whereas the more spontaneous recall required by the prior interview procedures may have obscured some actual relationships.

A somewhat different pattern emerges if one considers only the "top 22" criteria, discussed in the previous section. While student interviewers and organizational interviewees absolutely agreed on the 22 most important criteria for selection and the 22 most important for appraisal, based on mean ratings, neither group of respondents perceived as strong a relationship between the two lists (i.e., between the top 22 selection criteria and the top 22 appraisal criteria). For both the students and the organizations, 5 of their top 22 selection criteria did not appear on their list of appraisal criteria at all; and, both groups of respondents eliminated exactly the same criteria from each list. These specific criteria will be further discussed in the next section. Inspection of the data also reveals that both the students and the organizations had only 4 of their top 10 selection criteria included in appraisal's top 10, although their top 10 lists were somewhat different (7 criteria in common for selection, 8 for appraisal).

In order to further analyze the relationship between the top 22 criteria for selection and those for appraisal, two applications of the Spearman Rank Correlation procedure were calculated. In the first, the 17 (of the top 22) criteria which the organizations rated as common to both selection and appraisal were re-ranked before calculating rho (see Table 5; rho = -.03). In the second procedure, the same 17 criteria were re-ranked as rated by student interviewers for both selection and appraisal (see Table 6; rho = -.39). (If random sampling were again assumed, both procedures resulted in non-significant values for rho.) Neither procedure, certainly, supported a positively perceived relationship, by either set of respondents, between the 17 criteria which were highest rated for both selection and appraisal.

Overall, the correlation figures suggest a stronger perceived relationship between selection and appraisal criteria than has been previously observed in this ongoing study. However, for the 17 criteria rated most important for both selection and appraisal, the evidence indicates that neither the student interviewers nor the organizational interviewees perceived the strong, positive relationship between selection and appraisal criteria which our theoretical and practical arguments suggest ought to exist. On the other hand, agreement on 17 important criteria that appear to be used by a wide range of organizations for both selection and appraisal (regardless of order of importance) may be an important finding related to practical limits on theoretical application.

Table 5

SPEARMAN RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENT FOR SEVENTEEN CRITERIA RATED BY ORGANIZATIONAL INTERVIEWEES AS MOST IMPORTANT FOR BOTH SELECTION AND APPRAISAL

Criteria Category: Number & Name	Orgs. Rank for Selection (OSC)	Orgs. Rank for Appraisal (OAC)	d	d^2
30, Motivation	1	7	-6	36
23, Integrity & Honesty	2	10.5	-8.5	72.25
1, Ability	3.5	3.5	0	0
6, Attitude	3.5	5	-1.5	2.25
4, Aptitude & Intelligence	5.5	14.5	-9	81
24, Interest	5.5	9	-3.5	12.25
9, Communication Skills	7	10.5	-3.5	12.25
31, Personality	8	17	-9	81
12, Dependability or Reliability	10	1	9	81
29, Maturity	10	14.5	-4.5	20.25
38, Self-confidence	10	12.5	-2.5	6.25
5, Attendance	13	2	11	121
10, Cooperation	13	8	5	25
22, Initiative	13	12.5	.5	.25
33, Public Interaction	15	16	-1	1
26, Knowledge	16	6	10	100
36, Responsibility	17	3.5	13.5	182.25
Totals	- -	- -	0	834.0

$r_s = -.03$ (corrected for ties)

Table 6

SPEARMAN RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENT FOR SEVENTEEN CRITERIA RATED BY STUDENT INTERVIEWERS AS MOST IMPORTANT FOR BOTH SELECTION AND APPRAISAL

Criteria Category: Number & Name	Student Rank for Selection (SSC)	Student Rank for Appraisal (SAC)	d	d^2
24, Interest	1	17	-16	256
30, Motivation	2	11	- 9	81
23, Integrity & Honesty	3	10	- 7	49
29, Maturity	4	7	- 3	9
6, Attitude	5	6	- 1	1
31, Personality	6	16	-10	100
9, Communication Skills	7	15	- 8	64
26, Knowledge	8	4	4	16
33, Public Interaction	9	12	- 3	9
1, Ability	10.5	2.5	8	64
38, Self-confidence	10.5	13.5	- 3	9
10, Cooperation	12.5	2.5	10	100
22, Initiative	12.5	8	4.5	20.25
36, Responsibility	14	1	13	169
4, Aptitude & Intelligence	15	13.5	1.5	2.25
12, Dependability or Reliability	16	5	11	121
5, Attendance	17	9	8	64
Totals	- -	- -	0	1134.5

$r_s = -.39$ (corrected for ties)

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Following the porposes for the study described on pages 1-2, the use of the standardized instrument for gathering data on selection and appraisal criteria proved both beneficial and at least potentially harmful. As opposed to prior data-gathering in this on-going study, criteria were rated for importance rather than merely on a "used/not used" dichotomy. Thus, the importance of a criterion could be judged on a basis other than the number of organizations reporting using it. In addition, however, even though feedback indicated little difficulty using the instrument, it may have unduely influenced responses by presenting the two scales side-by-side. A second trial of the instrument is currently underway to provide an additional basis for comparison with prior findings.

The most encouraging finding from this study was the degree of agreement between student interviewers and organizational interviewees. The correlation coefficients seemed encouraging; but, most remarkable, both sets of respondents not only agreed completely on the 22 most important criteria for selection and the 22 most important for appraisal, they agreed completely on the 17 criteria that were common to both lists. For both sets of respondents, the criteria which were eliminated from the top 22 appraisal criteria were: Appearance, Availability, Experience-general, Experience-specific, and Loyalty. The criteria in the top 22 on the appraisal list which were not on the respondents' lists of top 22 selection criteria were: Adabtability and Flexibility, Follows Directions, Judgment, Quality of Performance, and Quantity of Productivity. While an argument could be advanced that there are rational reasons for these particular criteria to appear on one list and be absent on the other, one could also argue that one should not be selecting employees on the basis of Appearance or Loyalty, for example, unless these are going to be important for appraisal later on. Even more obviously, from the organization's viewpoint, if employees are to be evaluated during appraisal procedures in an important way on any of the above criteria which were not on the list of important selection criteria, then it would seem to be prudent (if not absolutely necessary) to find some way of assessing those qualities in the applicant before hiring. The authors might speculate that many organizations do, in fact, make selection judgments on these criteria—in indirect, if not direct, ways. Interview questions about "backround" or "relocatability" might lead to judgments about Adaptability and Flexibility. Background questions could also lead to conclusions about the applicant's Judgment, Quality of Performance, or Productivity. Filling out an application form or meeting deadlines for various selection procedures might provide information about how the applicant Follows Directions.

As discussed at the beginning of this paper, the authors argue that there should be substantial agreement between selection criteria and appraisal criteria. Government regulations often require it (with hiring based on BFOQs) and prudent management should support it. Although, as suggested earlier, there may be some sound reasons for not including <u>all</u> of the same criteria in both procedures, there are also sound reasons for organizations to give <u>more</u> attention to the relationship between the criteria by which they select employees and those by which they later appraise those same employees. The current sample of organizations appears to see that relationship somewhat more directly than previous samples; but, since none of the samples have been randomly selected (and the problems involved in doing so seem insurmountable), generalization is probably unwise. For example, we do not mean to

suggest a trend toward greater similarity between selection and sppraisal criteria, as much as we would applaud such a trend. We do suggest that continued attention to this problem, both through education and research, is not only warranted but necessary. Our plans call for continued investigation. We hope others will join in such research and education.

REFERENCES

Ferguson, J. A. Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1959.

Field, H. S., & Holley, W. H. Performance appraisal: an analysis of state-wide practices. Public Personnel Management, 1975, 4, 145-150; 327-330.

Hakel, M. D., & Schuh, A. A. Job applicant attributes judged important across seven divergent occupations. Personnel Psychology, 1971, 24, 45-52.

Howell, M. A., & Vincent, J. W. Factor analysis of interview data. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1970, 54, 313-315.

Nie, N. H.; Hull, C. H.; Jenkins, J. G.; Steinbrenner, K.; & Brent, D. H. SPSS: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (2nd. Ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975.

Perrill, N. K., & Bueschel, S. L. Selection and appriasal in ninety-seven organizations: relationships between citeria used and relationships between size and interview structure. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association. Acapulco, Mexico, 1980.

Siegel, S. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956.

APPENDIX A

ORGANIZATIONAL SURVEY
of
SELECTION & APPRAISAL CRITERIA

The following is a list of criteria, standards, or categories for evaluation of applicants for employment and/or employees. The list was developed over a period of years, through research in more than 150 business, governmental, and service organizations. It represents some criteria used in selection among applicants for employment, some used in appraisal of employees during performance-review evaluation, and some used in both selection and appraisal.

Each broad criterion-category represents a synthesis of similar and related concepts, so a series of explanatory phrases has been provided for each. Please study each criterion-category and decide the IMPORTANCE of that criterion, in your organization, for SELECTION and for APPRAISAL.

In determining the IMPORTANCE of each criterion, please use the following scale:

0 = Not used at all

1 = Used, but Extremely Unimportant

2 = Used, but Unimportant

3 = Used; Neither Important nor Unimportant

4 = Used, and Important

5 = Used, and Extremely Important

Specific Instructions:
For each major criterion-category on the left, circle the number in each column on the right which best describes the IMPORTANCE of that criterion in your organization—for SELECTION (during hiring for employment) and for APPRAISAL (during evaluation or review of the performance of employees).

CRITERIA CATEGORIES	IMPORTANCE IN SELECTION						IMPORTANCE IN APPRAISAL					
01 ABILITY (General "can-do traits," such as technical competence, ability to handle details or paperwork, teaching or training ability, salesmanship, etc.)	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
02 ADAPTABILITY & FLEXIBILITY (Including versatility or ability to adjust to changing conditions.)	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
03 APPEARANCE (Including neatness, grooming, dress, etc.)	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5

Use SCALE on page 1; circle the number in each column on the right which best describes the IMPORTANCE of that CRITERION-CATEGORY, in your organization—for SELECTION and for APPRAISAL.

	CRITERIA CATEGORIES	IMPORTANCE IN SELECTION						IMPORTANCE IN APPRAISAL					
04	APTITUDE & INTELLIGENCE (Indications of potential to learn new jobs, skills, abilities, etc.)	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
05	ATTENDANCE (Including punctuality & absenteeism, etc.)	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
06	ATTITUDE (Outer-directed attitudes toward the work environment, the organization, co-workers, etc.)	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
07	AVAILABILITY (For days, hours, & locations needed, including willingness to relocate, etc.)	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
08	CHARACTER (Including morals, law violations, & "bad habits," such as drinking, smoking, swearing, etc.)	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
09	COMMUNICATION SKILLS (Interpersonal communication, verbal & non-verbal.)	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
10	COOPERATION (Including "getting along" with co-workers & supervisors, courtesy, etc.)	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
11	DEMOGRAPHICS (Includes consideration of age, citizenship, marital status, minority membership, number of dependents, sex, etc.)	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5

Using the SCALE on Page 1 as your guide, circle the number in each column on the right which best describes the IMPORTANCE of that CRITERION-CATEGORY, in your organization—for SELECTION and for APPRAISAL.

CRITERIA CATEGORIES	IMPORTANCE IN SELECTION						IMPORTANCE IN APPRAISAL					
12 DEPENDABILITY OR RELIABILITY (In meeting deadlines, objectives, assignments, etc.)	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
13 EDUCATION OR TRAINING (Including degrees or certificates, institutions attended, grades, etc.)	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
14 ELIGIBILITY (Includes meeting requirements of the position in terms of seniority, credentials, affirmative action, fair employment practices, etc.)	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
15 EVALUATION BY OTHERS (I.e., evaluations from other than the decision-makers: such as, references, peer evaluations, and recommendations of consultants, auditors, "shoppers," outside professionals, etc.)	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
16 EXPERIENCE - GENERAL (Breadth & variety of past employment or non-employment experience, etc.)	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
17 EXPERIENCE - SPECIFIC (Prior experience in a similar position or performing duties to be expected, duration of employment or non-employment experience directly related to the position, etc.)	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
18 FOLLOWS DIRECTIONS (Includes adherence to organizational policies, going "by the book," etc.)	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5

Continue using the SCALE on Page 1 as your guide. Circle the number in each column on the right which best describes the IMPORTANCE of that CRITERION-CATEGORY, in your organization—for SELECTION and for APPRAISAL.

	CRITERIA CATEGORIES	IMPORTANCE IN SELECTION						IMPORTANCE IN APPRAISAL					
19	HEALTH & PHYSICAL CONDITION (Includes needed strength, stamina, & agility, as well as general health, ailments, handicaps, etc.)	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
20	HONORS & RECOGNITION (Including outstanding achievements, awards, reputation in the field, etc.)	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
21	HOUSEKEEPING BEHAVIOR (Management of work area, organization or neatness of work environment, etc.)	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
22	INITIATIVE (Including innovation, creativity, being a "self-starter," willingness to direct own efforts, etc.)	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
23	INTEGRITY & HONESTY (Including sincerity, truthfulness, keeping one's word, etc.)	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
24	INTEREST (In the position and/or the organization, etc.)	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
25	JUDGMENT (Includes making appropriate decisions & choices, especially in ambiguous situations, etc.)	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
26	KNOWLEDGE (Of position, product, services, customers, specific subject-matter, etc.; expertness.)	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5

Now that you have completed nearly 2/3 of the survey, let us remind you of the SCALE on Page 1: 0 = Not used at all; 1 = Used, but Extremely Unimportant; 2 = Used, but Unimportant; 3 = Used, Neither Important nor Unimportant; 4 = Used, and Important; 5 = Used, and Extremely Important.

Continuing to use this scale as your guide, circle the number in each column on the right which best describes the IMPORTANCE of that CRITERION-CATEGORY, in your organization—for SELECTION and for APPRAISAL.

	CRITERIA CATEGORIES	IMPORTANCE IN SELECTION						IMPORTANCE IN APPRAISAL					
27	LEADERSHIP ABILITY (Includes supervision or management skills, and/or the ability to guide, inspire, or gain cooperation of others, etc.)	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
28	LOYALTY (Commitment or faithful adherence to the organization and/or employer; good security risk; not a "job hopper"; etc.)	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
29	MATURITY (Emotional maturity, stability, demonstrated self-control, etc.)	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
30	MOTIVATION (Drive, desire, ambition, goal orientation, enthusiasm, effort, aggressiveness, etc.)	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
31	PERSONALITY (Friendliness, "gregariousness," an out-going manner, etc.)	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
32	PROMOTABILITY (Potential for advancement or promotion; upward mobility in the organization, etc.)	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
33	PUBLIC INTERACTION (Includes interaction with an organization's "public" to create good will, a good image, etc.; a good "representative" of the organization, etc.)	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5

Continue using the SCALE on Page 1 as your guide. Circle the number in each column on the right which best describes the IMPORTANCE of that CRITERION-CATEGORY, in your organization—for SELECTION and for APPRAISAL.

	CRITERIA CATEGORIES	IMPORTANCE IN SELECTION						IMPORTANCE IN APPRAISAL					
34	QUALITY OF PERFORMANCE (Past or present level of attainment or achievement; includes accuracy, effectiveness, etc.)	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
35	QUANTITY OF PRODUCTIVITY (Amount of past or present output; includes speed, efficiency, number of customers or orders, etc.)	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
36	RESPONSIBILITY (Accountable; accepts obligations; willingness to accept consequences of behavior; etc.)	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
37	SAFETY (Sensitivity to safety needs; awareness of hazards; willingness to follow safety standards; alertness to accident prevention; etc.)	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
38	SELF CONFIDENCE (An inner-directed, positive attitude toward self; good self-image; belief in or reliance on oneself or one's abilities; etc.)	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
39	SKILLS (Physical skill or dexterity; machine & equipment operation; proficiency; etc.)	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
40	TEST RESULTS (Evaluation based on testing—aptitude, intelligence, personality, polygraph, specific skills tests, etc.)	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5

LAST PAGE; almost done!

For item 41, Other, if we have missed any criteria-categories that are used in your organization--during selection, appraisal, or both--please write them in the blanks provided. Contuing to use the SCALE on Page 1 as your guide, circle the number in each column on the right which best describes the IMPORTANCE of each of the criteria you have written in, as used in your organization--for SELECTION and/or for APPRAISAL.

CRITERIA CATEGORIES	IMPORTANCE IN SELECTION	IMPORTANCE IN APPRAISAL
41 OTHER (Write in as many as desired)		
_____	0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5
_____	0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5
_____	0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5
_____	0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5
_____	0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5

COMMENTS: (Any comments, good or bad, will be appreciated--regarding the survey, this form, the conduct of the person(s) contacting you, or anything else you wish to add about the Selection and/or Appraisal procedures in your organization.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

INFORMATION: This page will be coded & removed prior to the coding of pages 1-6; however, for purposes of our control, coding, and data-analysis, may we please have the following additional information--

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION IN THIS SURVEY.

Your Name: _____

Your Title or Position: _____

The Name of your Organization: _____

If applicable, please indicate the unit or sub-division that you represent: _____

Principal product or Service: _____

contact name and address goes here.

25

APPENDIX B

Student's And Organization's
Mean Ratings of Criteria
And Correlation Between Ratings

Criteria	Students		Organizations		Correlations*			
	SSC* $\bar{X}$	SAC* $\bar{X}$	OSC* $\bar{X}$	OAC* $\bar{X}$	SSC/ OSC	SAC/ OAC	SSC/ SAC	OSC/ OAC
1	3.91	4.43	4.16	4.55	.54	.41	.45	.19
2	3.31	3.84	3.61	4.07	.57	.41	.57	.63
3	3.86	3.55	4.02	3.61	.59	.65	.82	.68
4	3.74	4.07	4.14	4.23	.56	.73	.64	.42
5	3.70	4.25	3.96	4.57	.44	.17	.35	.23
6	4.12	4.39	4.16	4.48	.73	.11	.37	.42
7	3.88	3.17	3.89	3.52	.06	.48	.42	.48
8	3.40	3.27	3.30	3.50	.59	.66	.70	.82
9	4.02	4.05	4.11	4.33	.37	.44	.54	.59
10	3.88	4.43	3.90	4.36	.58	.15	.37	.25
11	1.91	1.24	1.82	1.43	.39	.35	.57	.69
12	3.72	4.41	4.02	4.59	.64	.08	.57	.46
13	3.09	2.38	3.05	2.57	.74	.50	.46	.45
14	2.72	2.37	3.19	2.91	.50	.43	.52	.47
15	2.77	2.57	3.00	2.86	.27	.47	.22	.56
16	3.68	2.26	3.96	2.61	.26	.34	.21	.23
17	3.84	2.84	3.93	2.61	.51	.33	.06	.16
18	3.26	4.14	3.34	4.27	.56	.49	.59	.64
19	3.02	2.52	2.96	2.75	.53	.53	.72	.71
20	1.86	2.00	2.48	2.34	.38	.37	.72	.43
(continued)					$\bar{X}$=.49 SD=.16 Var=.02	$\bar{X}$=.41 SD=.17 Var=.03	$\bar{X}$=.51 SD=.20 Var=.04	$\bar{X}$=.48 SD=.22 Var=.05

NOTE:*

SSC = Student's Selection Criteria Ratings
SAC = Student's Appraisal Criteria Ratings
OSC = Organization's Selection Criteria Ratings
OAC = Organization's Appraisal Criteria Ratings

APPENDIX B, Continued

Student's And Organizations
Mean Ratings of Criteria
And Correlation Between Ratings

Criteria	Students		Organizations		Correlations*			
	SSC* $\bar{X}$	SAC* $\bar{X}$	OSC* $\bar{X}$	OAC* $\bar{X}$	SSC/ OSC	SAC/ OAC	SSC/ SAC	OSC/ OAC
21	2.62	3.50	2.46	3.46	.52	.35	.65	.62
22	3.88	4.28	3.96	4.25	.28	.38	.05	.35
23	4.15	4.24	4.19	4.32	.53	.59	.82	.83
24	4.27	3.93	4.14	4.39	.38	.18	.51	.41
25	3.41	4.14	3.64	4.52	.43	.55	.63	.15
26	3.98	4.42	3.80	4.43	.45	.29	.29	.27
27	3.26	3.79	3.61	4.05	.50	.03	.47	.41
28	3.60	3.65	3.77	3.80	.24	.32	.50	.46
29	4.14	4.33	4.02	4.23	.60	.28	.58	.46
30	4.19	4.23	4.27	4.39	.40	.24	.83	.78
31	4.07	3.98	4.09	4.07	.74	.62	.60	.63
32	2.43	3.12	3.14	3.61	.55	.24	.73	.67
33	3.93	4.19	3.86	4.21	.61	.55	.68	.41
34	3.56	4.65	3.46	4.59	.27	.39	.23	.04
35	3.07	4.19	3.02	4.21	.31	.39	.44	.52
36	3.79	4.47	3.68	4.55	.47	.39	.34	.18
37	2.67	3.12	2.73	3.28	.59	.63	.65	.82
38	3.91	4.07	4.02	4.25	.39	.49	.37	.25
39	3.07	3.49	3.30	3.46	.69	.61	.77	.83
40	1.60	1.46	1.93	1.56	.73	.69	.57	.72
					$\bar{X}$=.49 SD=.16 Var=.02	$\bar{X}$=.41 SD=.17 Var=.03	$\bar{X}$=.51 SD=.20 Var=.04	$\bar{X}$=.48 SD=.22 Var=.05

NOTE:*

SSC = Student's Selection Criteria Ratings
SAC = Student's Appraisal Criteria Ratings
OSC = Organization's Selection Criteria Ratings
OAC = Organization's Appraisal Criteria Ratings